

Message

From: Berkoff, Michael [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F347C01A92D7424FA840C24F6B7FBF6B-MBERKOFF]
Sent: 5/15/2014 12:55:53 AM
To: Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com; bemerchant@gmail.com; BUCHOLTZP@michigan.gov; Hattonm@kalamazoocity.org
Subject: RE: Attached Outline for May 19 Powerpoint Presentation

In order to have our audience understand that the geographic perspective for our statements ranges beyond the Allied Landfill OU, we need to make a specific statement about that. Otherwise, people will think that the statements are just for Allied Landfill.

From: Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com [mailto:Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 11:09 AM
To: bemerchant@gmail.com; Berkoff, Michael; BUCHOLTZP@michigan.gov; Hattonm@kalamazoocity.org
Subject: RE: Attached Outline for May 19 Powerpoint Presentation

Couple of minor suggestions, in the PP:

Agree with Bruce's concern in 1 Below. This is part of a bigger plan to the City, for EPA we tend to focus on the landfill and final cleanup of the rest of the operable unit.

- 1) Inserted landfill when discussing configurations and used site and surrounding areas (Panalyte and Strebor) to assist with describing hybrid or blended development

I agree with Bruce's 4th issue and I think as a talking point we need to define "long term perspective" for all of the parties. My interpretation is the cleanup and landfill configuration come first, with long term redevelopment in mind, then the redevelopment aspect begins. I don't want EPA mgt. to come away with the idea that the "cleanup" will take 10-20 years. We can complete the cleanup once the configuration has been determined and make the properties available for redevelopment. This should fit with EPA's goal of completing the RA while recognizing the redevelopment will take additional time.

That is all I have it is looking good.

JK

Jeff Keiser
 Project Manager
 135 S. 84th Street, Suite 400
 Milwaukee, WI 53214
 Direct -- 414 847-0382
 e-Fax -- 414 454-9766
 Mobile 414 467-4893
www.jkeiser@ch2m.com

Solutions without Boundaries

From: Bruce Merchant [mailto:bemerchant@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 9:07 AM
To: Berkoff, Michael; Bucholtz, Paul (DEQ); Keiser, Jeff/MKE; Hatton, Marc
Subject: Re: Attached Outline for May 19 Powerpoint Presentation

Good Morning All -

Michael sent me recommended changes to the draft Powerpoint I sent out yesterday. I've incorporated them into the attached document. I do have a couple of questions regarding those changes that possibly the entire group can help with a bit.

First, I realize that we are dealing with the Allied Landfill OU as part of our discussions. However, we have also discussed in great detail much of the surrounding area as well as the Panelyte Site. I'm concerned that if we only refer to the Allied Landfill OU in the presentation we might be indicating we've limited our discussion only to the Allied Landfill OU. I'm not sure how to address that so I've kept the verbage I had in the original version I sent out yesterday (Allied Superfund Site) until I get some more feedback on this. I don't want to get all wrapped up in terminology at this point either but it may help to clarify this - at least verbally - at Monday's meeting.

Second, I incorporated some of Michael's recommendations into the Restatement of Purpose. Let me know what you think.

Third, on our goals for the Next Check-In Point. I added the phrase "including public engagement" after "Develop strategies for Moving Forward." I think the public engagement piece is important; however, it is not the only strategy that we need to consider as we move forward.

Fourth, under "Established Goals for Current Efforts", I tried to simply reiterate from my notes what I felt we had discussed. Item 2 on keeping a long-term perspective was to ensure that we all understood that implementation of a remedy plus any potential redevelopment will take a great deal of time. Under item 5, I tried to clarify that the main issue was how best to engage the public as we move forward with a hybrid solution. My notes indicated that "the City would assist with this aspect." I didn't include that in item 5 but I can, if desired.

Fifth, I believe I incorporated Michael's suggestions fairly directly into the remaining slides. I modified item 3 under "Several Keys for Redevelopment Opportunities" the trailway being connected to both the KVRT (Kalamazoo Valley River Trail) and Portage.

Please let me know your thoughts/ideas on the slides. I want the Powerpoint to represent the group's thinking. I have obtained some clerical assistance on the Powerpoint so I hope to have something that is a little more professional when it's all done. I'll send that along as soon as the edits are made.

Please note as well that I am sending out two versions - a "marked up" version showing the changes as well as a "clean" version. A clean version helps me see what the final product looks like without all the mark-ups.

Please respond by noon tomorrow (Thursday, May 15) so I can get the final version out to you by Friday.

Thanks.

Bruce

On Tue, May 13, 2014 at 3:18 PM, Bruce Merchant <bemerchant@gmail.com> wrote:
Michael -

Thank you for the edits/recommendations. I will incorporate into the Powerpoint which I should be able to send out tomorrow.

Bruce

On 5/13/2014 2:39 PM, Berkoff, Michael wrote:

Bruce,

Thank you for putting this together. I made some edits to this. I tried to trim stuff down a bit. We need to clarify some stuff too, like the redevelopment goals slide.

From: Bruce Merchant [<mailto:bmerchant@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 11:38 AM

To: Berkoff, Michael; Bucholtz, Paul (DEQ); jeff.keiser@ch2m.com; Hatton, Marc

Subject: Attached Outline for May 19 Powerpoint Presentation

Good Afternoon Michael, Paul, Jeff, and Marc -

Attached are some proposed slides for the Powerpoint presentation next Monday, May 19. I was most interested in getting the concepts down on paper than worrying about format, etc... I will likely break up these up into more slides as we work on them.

Please review the content and let me know of any changes. As you may recall, what we agreed to yesterday was the following order of presentation and presenters:

Slides 1 & 2 - Paul (to discuss Restatement of Purpose, Results and Goals for next check-in point.

Slides 3 & 4 - Marc (to discuss Goals for the current efforts, overall focus as well as keys for redevelopment opportunities)

Slide 5 - Michael and Bruce (Realities of the Site and strategies for moving forward) - I will likely break these up into 2 slides

Slide 6 - Paul (Summary and proposed date for next check-in point)

I kept the wording fairly sparse on purpose. I think that will help us expand on the issues during our presentation.

Please let me know any changes, edits, modifications, or other suggestions as soon as feasible. I'm working on setting up the Powerpoint. It won't be too "fancy" but I want to make it a least a little interesting and inviting.

Thanks for all the great discussion yesterday. I'm encouraged and excited about moving forward.

As a side note - the presentation at the City Commission meeting last night went fairly well. Several Commissioners expressed the desire for redevelopment and one even acknowledged that total removal is likely not going to happen. I also "softened the beach head" with several comments regarding about the length of time involved in any site remedy as well as redevelopment. Progress!

Bruce